

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on July 21, 2004.

Claims 1-8 and 28-43 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3, 28-31 and 36-39 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Joy et al. (U.S. 6,359,233). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests the Office to consider the following.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), M.P.E.P. §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 1).

Claim 1 requires “... a bond finger disposed on the first surface, wherein the bond finger includes a metallization in the substrate” (Claim 1). Joy invariably teaches his metallization (bus bar 19) is above and on the surface of his substrate (web 11). Joy also invariably teaches his bond finger (e.g., gold layer 29 and nickel layer 27) is above the surface of his substrate (web 11). For either these two structural mismatches between what is claimed and what Joy teaches, Joy does not anticipate the claims. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-8 and 28-43 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joy et al. in view of Jackson (U.S. 5,097,100). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests the Office to consider the following.


To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable

expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (M.P.E.P. § 2143 8th Ed, Rev.1).

The Office Action admits that "Joy ... does not teach the conductive pad being two gold layers, nor does [Joy] teach the thickness of the conductive pad." (Office Action at page 3). The Office Action appeals to Jackson to remedy that which it characterizes as what Joy does not teach.

Regarding the first criterion, Jackson's disclosure is contemplated for a structure "subject to corrosion in the environment where they are used ... for vehicle, vessel, and aerospace inertial navigation devices downhole oil well measurement and other uses." (Jackson at column 1, lines 8 *et seq*). Joy is silent about harsh corrosive environments. The suggestion to combine these references appears to come from Applicant's disclosure and not from the references themselves.

Regarding the third criterion, Jackson also fails to teach that Joy does not teach; the elements of instant claim 1, "... a bond finger disposed on the first surface, wherein the bond finger includes a metallization in the substrate" (Claim 1). Because all the claims limitations have not been taught in the combination of the cited references, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.



AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 10/608,059

Filing Date: June 27, 2003

Title: USE OF DIRECT GOLD SURFACE FINISH ON A COPPER WIRE-BOND SUBSTRATE, METHODS OF MAKING SAME, AND METHODS OF TESTING SAME (As Amended)

Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 10

Dkt: 884.887US1 (INTEL)

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney, John Greaves at (801) 278-9171, or Applicants' below-named representative at (612) 349-9592 to facilitate the prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN TAGGERT ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 349-9592

Date Sept. 20, 2004

By Ann M. McCrackin
Ann M. McCrackin
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 21 day of September, 2004.

Chris Hammond

Name

Chris Hammond

Signature